



## Complete Summary

---

### **GUIDELINE TITLE**

Peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)**

Peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration. Nephrology 2005 Oct;10(S4):S104-7.

Peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration. Westmead NSW (Australia): CARI - Caring for Australians with Renal Impairment; 2004 May. 10 p. [48 references]

### **GUIDELINE STATUS**

This is the current release of the guideline.

## COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE  
METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE  
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT  
CATEGORIES  
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY  
DISCLAIMER

## SCOPE

### **DISEASE/CONDITION(S)**

End-stage kidney disease (ESKD)

### **GUIDELINE CATEGORY**

Evaluation  
Management  
Treatment

### **CLINICAL SPECIALTY**

Nephrology

## **INTENDED USERS**

Allied Health Personnel  
Nurses  
Physicians

## **GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)**

To recommend when an initial peritoneal equilibrium test (PET) should be done and then at what frequency it should be repeated

## **TARGET POPULATION**

Patients with end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) on peritoneal dialysis

## **INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED**

### **Evaluation**

Peritoneal equilibration test (PET) after initiation of peritoneal dialysis

### **Management/Treatment**

1. Initiation of peritoneal dialysis
2. Repeat monitoring of PET

## **MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED**

- Peritoneal clearance
- Residual renal function
- Mortality

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE**

Searches of Electronic Databases

### **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE**

**Databases searched:** Medline (1966 to November Week 2 2003). Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and text words for peritoneal equilibrium test (PET), ultrafiltration and peritoneal dialysis were used. The search strategy was not limited by study type.

**Date of search:** 18 November 2003.

### **NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS**

Not stated

## **METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

### **Levels of Evidence**

**Level I:** Evidence obtained from a systematic review of all relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs)

**Level II:** Evidence obtained from at least one properly designed RCT

**Level III:** Evidence obtained from well-designed pseudo-randomized controlled trials (alternate allocation or some other method); comparative studies with concurrent controls and allocation not randomized, cohort studies, case-control studies, interrupted time series with a control group; comparative studies with historical control, two or more single arm studies, interrupted time series without a parallel control group

**Level IV:** Evidence obtained from case series, either post-test or pretest/post-test

## **METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Review of Published Meta-Analyses  
Systematic Review with Evidence Tables

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Not stated

## **METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Expert Consensus

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Not stated

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Not applicable

## **COST ANALYSIS**

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

## **METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

Comparison with Guidelines from Other Groups  
Peer Review

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

Recommendations of Others. Recommendations regarding peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration from the following groups were discussed: Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative, British Renal Association, Canadian Society of Nephrology, European Best Practice Guidelines, and International Society of Peritoneal Dialysis.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

Definitions for the levels of evidence (I–IV) can be found at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

#### **Guidelines**

No recommendations possible based on Level I or II evidence

#### **Suggestions for Clinical Care**

(Suggestions are based on Level III and IV sources)

- A patient's membrane transport status should be evaluated by the standard peritoneal equilibration test (PET).
- A PET should be performed approximately 4 weeks after initiating peritoneal dialysis, but no earlier.
- PETs should be repeated at 2 years and then annually. PETs should be repeated earlier if there is clinical evidence of fluid overload with a significant decrease in ultrafiltration, hypertension or elevated serum urea levels, particularly in those patients who have had episodes of peritonitis.
- Icodextrin should not be used in the preceding exchange before a PET as it increases the dialysate:plasma (D/P) creatinine ratio.
- There is some evidence that there is a group of patients with high transporter status who have an increased mortality and an increased risk of technique failure, even with adequate small solute clearance; however, this is not conclusive.

#### **Definitions:**

#### **Levels of Evidence**

**Level I:** Evidence obtained from a systematic review of all relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs)

**Level II:** Evidence obtained from at least one properly designed RCT

**Level III:** Evidence obtained from well-designed pseudo-randomized controlled trials (alternate allocation or some other method); comparative studies with concurrent controls and allocation not randomized, cohort studies, case-control studies, interrupted time series with a control group; comparative studies with historical control, two or more single arm studies, interrupted time series without a parallel control group

**Level IV:** Evidence obtained from case series, either post-test or pretest/post-test

### **CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)**

None provided

## **EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for each recommendation (see "Major Recommendations").

## **BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

Appropriate management of peritoneal equilibration testing in patients with end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) on peritoneal dialysis

### **POTENTIAL HARMS**

There is some evidence that there is a group of patients with high transporter status who have an increased mortality and an increased risk of technique failure, even with adequate small solute clearance; however, this is not conclusive.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE**

### **DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

#### **Implementation and Audit**

Reporting of peritoneal transport parameters to the Australia and New Zealand Dialysis and Transplant Registry (ANZDATA) on an annual basis should be encouraged. ANZDATA should report outcomes according to peritoneal transport status.

## INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

### IOM CARE NEED

Living with Illness

### IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

## IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration. Nephrology 2005 Oct;10(S4):S104-7.

Peritoneal transport and ultrafiltration. Westmead NSW (Australia): CARI - Caring for Australians with Renal Impairment; 2004 May. 10 p. [48 references]

### ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

### DATE RELEASED

2005 Oct

### GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

Caring for Australasians with Renal Impairment - Disease Specific Society

### SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

Industry-sponsored funding administered through Kidney Health Australia

### GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Not stated

### COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

*Authors:* David Harris, Convenor (Westmead, New South Wales); Merlin Thomas (Pahran, Victoria); David Johnson (Woolloongabba, Queensland); Kathy Nicholls (Parkville, Victoria); Adrian Gillin (Camperdown, New South Wales)

### FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

All guideline writers are required to fill out a declaration of conflict of interest.

## **GUIDELINE STATUS**

This is the current release of the guideline.

## **GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY**

Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the [Caring for Australasians with Renal Impairment \(CARI\) Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from Caring for Australasians with Renal Impairment, Locked Bag 4001, Centre for Kidney Research, Westmead NSW, Australia 2145

## **AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS**

The following is available:

- The CARI guidelines. A guide for writers. Caring for Australasians with Renal Impairment. 2006 May. 6 p.

Electronic copies: Available from the [Caring for Australasians with Renal Impairment \(CARI\) Web site](#).

## **PATIENT RESOURCES**

None available

## **NGC STATUS**

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI Institute on April 22, 2008.

## **COPYRIGHT STATEMENT**

This NGC summary is based on the original guideline, which is subject to the guideline developer's copyright restrictions.

## **DISCLAIMER**

### **NGC DISCLAIMER**

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC

Inclusion Criteria which may be found at  
<http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

#### [Copyright/Permission Requests](#)

Date Modified: 6/15/2009

